

ORIGINAL



0000020756

BEFORE THE ARIZONA CORPORATION COMMISSION **RECEIVED**

WILLIAM A. MUNDELL

Chairman

JAMES M. IRVIN

Commissioner

MARC SPITZER

Commissioner

2001 SEP 10 P 12:09

AZ CORP COMMISSION
DOCUMENT CONTROL

**IN THE MATTER OF U S WEST
COMMUNICATIONS, INC.'S
COMPLIANCE WITH § 271 OF THE
TELECOMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1996**

Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238

AT&T'S REPLY BRIEF ON SECTION 272 OF THE ACT

September 7, 2001

Arizona Corporation Commission

DOCKETED

SEP 10 2001

DOCKETED BY	<i>mae</i>
-------------	------------

TABLE OF CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	ARGUMENTS.....	2
A.	Section 272(h) and the so-called “Transition Phase”	2
B.	Section 272(b)(2) and compliance with GAAP - Issue 272-2	7
C.	Audit Prior to Section 272 Relief (Issue 272-4)	10
D.	Section 272(b)(3) – Issue 272-7.....	11
E.	Section 272(b)(5) - Issue 272-13	12
F.	Section 272(c)(2) - Issue 272-16.....	14
G.	Section 272(c)(1) - Issue 272-15.....	16
H.	Qwest’s Past History - Issue 272-20	16
III.	CONCLUSION.....	18

AT&T'S REPLY BRIEF ON SECTION 272 OF THE ACT

AT&T Communications of the Mountain States, Inc. and AT&T Local Services on behalf of TCG Phoenix, (collectively, "AT&T") hereby file their reply brief on Qwest's compliance with section 272 of the Telecommunications Act of 1996.

I. INTRODUCTION

The most apparent difference between the brief of AT&T and the brief of Qwest Corporation ("Qwest") is the different perspective of the parties regarding the factual history of Qwest's section 272 compliance and the ultimate conclusions that are drawn from the facts. AT&T sees a historical pattern of noncompliance. Qwest sees "hiccups", "one-time delays" and "catch-up billing", and relies on a "transition" to a new section 272 affiliate to justify noncompliance with section 272. Nor does Qwest see its "mistakes" as failures to comply with section 272. Based on the totality of the evidence, AT&T believes only one conclusion can be drawn: Qwest has failed to comply with section 272, and its attitude regarding instances of past noncompliance leaves no doubt that it will fail to comply with section 272 in the future.

Qwest has mentioned in its brief that Qwest Communications International, Inc. ("QCI"), which is the parent of Qwest Communications Corporation ("QCC"), is already the nation's fourth-largest interexchange carrier.¹ This makes it all the more imperative that the provisions of section 272 be implemented correctly. The Federal Communications Commission ("FCC") made it clear that it viewed the structural and

¹ Qwest Brief at 9. In its brief filed in the multistate docket, Qwest referred to QCC as the fourth largest interLATA provider. No explanation is given as to the change in distinction and entity in its Arizona Brief. Perhaps Qwest wishes to downplay QCC's present involvement in the intraLATA and interLATA toll markets. However, given that Qwest's own testimony boasts that QCC is "already the fourth largest interLATA provider nationwide", it is clear that QCC is well positioned in the toll market. 7 Qwest 1 at 9.

nondiscrimination safeguards of section 272 to be of "crucial importance" because they "ensure that competitors will have nondiscriminatory access to essential inputs on terms that do not favor the BOC's affiliate [and] further discourage, and facilitate detection of, improper cost allocation and cross subsidization between the BOC and its 272 affiliate."²

Qwest's section 272 affiliate is not starting from scratch; it is already a very large interLATA, or interexchange, carrier, which makes it even more important that the section 272 safeguards are properly in place and implemented.

Finally, Qwest states that its section 272 compliance was modeled after the FCC's previous section 271 approval orders.³ However, it is apparent that Qwest's focus was much narrower. As discussed in AT&T's initial brief,⁴ Qwest only benchmarked itself on the SBC-Texas Order. Implicit in Qwest's strategy is the belief that SBC-Texas is dispositive of any section 272 issues and the FCC's case-by-case approach is to be ignored. AT&T strongly disagrees with this view.

II. ARGUMENTS

A. Section 272(h) and the so-called "Transition Phase"

AT&T will follow the convention used by Qwest in its brief in discussing QCC's need for a so-called "transition phase" in the initial part of this reply brief, although this discussion in AT&T's initial brief was contained in several sections.

Initially, in its testimony, Qwest relied heavily on section 272(h) to support its "transition phase" arguments.⁵ At the Arizona workshop, Qwest even engaged in a bit of

² *Application of Ameritech Michigan Pursuant to Section 271 of the Communications Act of 1934, as amended, to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Services in Michigan*, CC Docket No. 97-137, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 97-298 (rel. Aug. 19, 1997), ¶ 346 ("Ameritech Michigan Order").

³ Qwest Brief at 5.

⁴ AT&T Brief at 7.

⁵ 7 Qwest 1 at 6 - 8.

legerdemain by using an exhibit that stated “Congress gave BOCs one year to comply with Section 272 [and] QCC became Section 272 compliant-ready in three months”⁶ The use of “one year” is an obvious reference to the language of section 272(h), and Qwest attempted to utilize that language as justification for its “transition”. In its brief, Qwest signaled its retreat from reliance on section 272(h).⁷ To circumvent the fact that the language in section 272 does not support its so-called “transition phase,” Qwest now relies on an argument by analogy to convince the Commission that Congress did carve out such a transition loophole and that it was for “considerable time.”⁸ This argument is quite convenient in that it is ambiguous enough and flexible enough to allow Qwest to subjectively decide what is a “considerable time” for its transition.⁹

As a corollary matter, AT&T would clarify Qwest’s apparent method of quoting its own attorney under the guise of an FCC pronouncement: “Moreover, Congress itself recognized ... what the FCC later did in SBC-Ameritech – that the requirements for Section 272 separation are extensive and therefore, ‘you don’t turn a 272 up on [a] dime.’”¹⁰ This is a quote of Qwest’s attorney, and not of the FCC. To wit: Mr. Steese: “I was just going to say, for purposes of filling out the record on this point, we talked a good bit about transition, that you don’t turn a 272 up on the dime.”¹¹

AT&T finds itself in agreement with Qwest that the focus on the “transition phase” issue obscures Qwest Long Distance’s (“Qwest LD’s”) prior record of compliance.¹² However, in Qwest LD’s case, it is more appropriate to characterize this

⁶ 7 Qwest 6 at 7.

⁷ Qwest Brief at 9, n. 17.

⁸ *Id.*

⁹ *Also see*, AT&T Brief at 20, n. 87, for further discussion of Qwest’s so-called “transition” argument.

¹⁰ Qwest Brief at 8.

¹¹ TR 143 (June 8, 2001). Transcript cites are to the multistate transcripts unless otherwise noted.

¹² Qwest Brief at 6.

as the *lack* of compliance. By way of example, AT&T discussed a blatant instance of Qwest LD's noncompliance in its brief,¹³ and it provided numerous examples in its testimony.¹⁴ Given the lengthy list of non-compliance examples, cited in the footnote below, it is alarming that Qwest stated at the workshop that "this [from Qwest LD] is where we gained all of our experience on how to operate a compliant 272 subsidiary."¹⁵

Qwest cites to section 272(a) for the proposition that it cannot provide "in-region, interLATA services except through [a Section 272 affiliate]."¹⁶ This is precisely the point that AT&T made in its initial brief. As discussed in its opening brief, because Qwest and the former U S WEST were found to have been providing in-region, interLATA services on at least three occasions in violation of section 271, also it was in violation of section 272(a) and, accordingly, Qwest could not possibly have had a compliant section 272 affiliate since the passage of the 1996 Telecommunications Act (the "Act").¹⁷ In light of the foregoing discussion, AT&T also disagrees with Qwest's characterization that section 272(a) issues duplicate section 272(b) issues.¹⁸

Qwest relies on self-righteous indignation regarding AT&T's audacity to question its compliance based upon the total accounting failure during the so-called "transition" period. Qwest's testimony stated, or rather demanded, that "The transitional period cannot be used to conclude how the BOC will meet the 272 requirements on a going

¹³ AT&T Brief at 19.

¹⁴ See 7 ATT 1, ¶¶ 35 (a) – (f); 45 (a), (c), (f) – (j); 53; 62 (a) – (e), 63 (a) – (p); 74; 75; 76 (a) – (c); 77; 85(d) – (e); 125; 126; 127; 145 – 147; 158 – 160.

¹⁵ AZ TR at 20 (June 11, 2001).

¹⁶ Qwest Brief at 12.

¹⁷ AT&T Brief at 3 - 5.

¹⁸ Qwest Brief at 12, n. 34.

forward basis. It would be completely unreasonable to look only at this [so-called] transitional period and conclude that the BOC will not meet the Section 272 rules going forward under more typical circumstances.”¹⁹ Qwest puts a different spin on the “transition” theme in its section 272 Brief. “AT&T would prefer that the Commission examine instead whether QCC happened to meet the extensive requirements for a Section 272 *affiliate before it was even identified as such*, or during this brief transition period.”²⁰

Given these two quotes, it is confusing what “transition” period Qwest is referring to. Qwest divides the so-called transition period into two distinct periods. The second period commences on or about January 1, 2001, and is the date that QCC was “identified” as the 272 affiliate. The first period is prior to the identification date. It is indisputable that from January to the end of March 2001, there was absolutely no accounting between QC and QCC because there was no billing. Evidently, this is the transition period that Ms. Schwartz refers to in the quoted testimony above. Qwest’s Brief must be referring to the “transition” sub-period prior to January 2001. Qwest seemingly wants the ACC to either ignore or forget about this glaring omission in compliance. The ACC should not be led astray by the confusion. There is an indisputable gap from January to the end of March 2001 with respect to accounting between QC and QCC. As QCC admitted in its testimony, “The transactions between July 1, 2000, and April 2001 were not concluded, posted, or billed in a timely manner.”²¹

¹⁹ 7 Qwest 2 at 7.

²⁰ Qwest Brief at 7.

²¹ 7 Qwest 4 at 5.

Further, Qwest admitted at the Arizona workshop that its processes and controls were not in place until March 26, 2001, despite the fact that QCC was “identified” in January.²²

Qwest’s argument that its so-called “transition phase” was prompted by “an unprecedented merger” begs the question: Why didn’t Qwest LD need a like transition phase? Both Qwest LD and QCC were subsidiaries in this unprecedented merger and Qwest admits that the merger “significantly transformed U S WEST and had significant impacts on *all* operational areas of its business.”²³ Yet, it was only necessary for QCC to have a two-tiered transition phase. It was only QCC that suffered from a severe case of the “one-time hiccups” in its accounting.²⁴ It was Qwest’s decision to drop Qwest LD in 2000 as its section 272 affiliate and replace it with QCC that necessitated a transition of QCC into compliance with section 272. The merger had nothing to do with QCC’s need for the shelter of a “considerable” transition period to come into compliance with section 272. Nothing prevented Qwest from maintaining Qwest LD as its section 272 affiliate until QCC was fully compliant with section 272.

Qwest’s statement that a decision was not made until January 2001 to abandon Qwest LD as the section 272 affiliate is wrong and misleading.²⁵ Qwest was winding down Qwest LD as the section 272 affiliate in September 2000.²⁶ Its own web sites provide evidence to the contrary,²⁷ and its legal department notified the multistate proceeding participants that “Qwest *is in the process of developing a transition plan* for

²² AZ TR 45 – 46 (June 11, 2001) (emphasis in the original).

²³ Qwest Brief at 9.

²⁴ AZ TR 22 - 23 (June 11, 2001).

²⁵ Qwest Brief at 10 (emphasis added).

²⁶ AT&T Brief at 27.

²⁷ *Id.* at 17.

another subsidiary to become Section 272 compliant.”²⁸ *This e-mail was sent on September 15, 2000.* Thus, the probative value of Qwest’s brief stating that it was not until January 2001 that the decision was made needs to be judged against the weight of evidence to the contrary.

B. Section 272(b)(2) and compliance with GAAP - Issue 272-2

AT&T has alleged that Qwest and QCC fail to follow a requirement of the *Accounting Safeguards Order* that mandates adherence to Generally Accepted Accounting Principles (“GAAP”).²⁹ AT&T has provided numerous examples of noncompliance by both QCC and QC.

Section 272(b)(2) states that the section 272 affiliate shall maintain its books, records and accounts in a manner prescribed by the FCC.³⁰ In its *Accounting Safeguards Order*, the FCC made it clear that the section 272 affiliate must follow GAAP.³¹

Qwest alleges that QCC’s compliance with GAAP is not relevant prior to March 26, 2001, because QCC did not become a section 272 affiliate until that date. This is nonsense, because as a subsidiary of a publicly-traded company, QCC has always been required to follow GAAP, regardless of the section 272 requirement to do so. Indeed Qwest admits to QCC’s noncompliance or “delays in billing,”³² which is evidently some kind of code for the complete failure to account for section 272 affiliated transactions for

²⁸ This item was included in AT&T’s testimony filed in Colorado and subsequent filings. Also, it was included in AT&T’s Brief in the Colorado Docket. *In the Matter of the Investigation into US WEST Communications, Inc.’s Compliance with section 271(c) of the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, Colorado Docket No. 97I-198T, AT&T’s Brief on Section 272 of the Act at 17.

²⁹ See AT&T Brief at 5 - 7 and 28, regarding discussion of noncompliance with GAAP as to sections 272 (b) and 272 (c)(2).

³⁰ 47 U.S.C. § 272(b)(2).

³¹ *Accounting Safeguards Under the Telecommunications Act of 1996*, CC Docket No. 96-150, Report and Order, FCC 96-490 (rel. Dec. 24, 1996), ¶ 167 (“*Accounting Safeguards Order*”).

³² Qwest Brief at 25.

a 10-month period. Further, QCC admitted “timeliness did not deter activities from being completed.”³³ This is tantamount to saying, “Why bother with accounting for transactions?”

Qwest implies throughout its brief that the departures from GAAP are not material. AT&T addressed the issue of materiality at length in its brief.³⁴ However, it should be noted that Part 32 requires compliance with Part 32 “irrespective of an individual item’s materiality under GAAP.”³⁵ Qwest must comply with 47 C.F.R. §32.27 in accordance with GAAP, irrespective of the materiality of the individual transaction.

Qwest appears to misdirect the Commission in its brief. Qwest seizes upon comments made by Mr. John Antonuk, the multistate workshop facilitator, to downplay or dismiss the section 272 GAAP requirements.³⁶ In fact, the facilitator readily acknowledged that “obviously you need to be following GAAP,” and his comments were in the greater context of blunting the probative value of Qwest’s proffer of an Arthur Andersen audit.³⁷ In light of Qwest’s use of the multistate facilitator’s quote, it is also instructive to emphasize that timeliness is a central principle of GAAP³⁸ and encompasses timely accounting, such as billing and transaction posting to accounts. The timely transaction posting that Mr. Antonuk refers to applies to the section 272(b)(5) 10-day website posting requirement which is a requirement separate from GAAP financial accounting.³⁹ This posting should not be confused with timely posting of accounting transactions to appropriate accounts and billing as required by GAAP.

³³ 7 Qwest 4 at 5.

³⁴ AT&T Brief at 7 - 9.

³⁵ 47 C.F.R. § 32.26.

³⁶ Qwest Brief at 14.

³⁷ 7 Qwest 11, TR 184 (June 7, 2001).

³⁸ AT&T Brief at 5.

³⁹ Qwest Brief at 14.

Finally, Qwest places heavy reliance on the Arthur Andersen audit opinion for its case that QCC was and is compliant with section 272(b)(5).⁴⁰ As mentioned in AT&T's brief, that audit was of QCI, and not QCC.⁴¹ Also, Mr. Antonuk recognized at the multistate workshops that this proffer had little merit:

I don't think this opinion [the Arthur Andersen opinion of QCI] tells you a lot about -- I don't think this is giving me a lot of evidence on whether or not 272 is being met or not. And I also don't think that a general conclusion about compliance with GAAP or noncompliance with GAAP is going to help me address 272 either.⁴²

Mr. Antonuk further elaborated on the dubious probative value of the Anderson audit opinion:

And I will tell you, I will be honest with you. The only reason I got into this issue at all, having done an affiliate audit or two in the telecommunications industry, and having looked at the annual reports of auditors, I am surprised at how few -- well, not surprised. *I always find that their work is not very helpful in addressing affiliate audits, because their test procedures don't -- generally don't include many of those kinds of transactions.* So, all I was really getting at is that *I am hoping that this debate is not going to end up focusing on the Andersen audit* as part of the annual audit, because that's happening at 50,000 feet, let's say, and I think we're, you know, a lot closer to the ground than that, as I read the Section 272 requirements.⁴³

Qwest's representative agreed with Mr. Antonuk regarding the lack of probative value of the Andersen audit.⁴⁴ Thus, it is surprising that Qwest again dredges up, and

⁴⁰ *Id.* at 13.

⁴¹ AT&T Brief at 8.

⁴² 7 Qwest 11, TR 184 (June 7, 2001).

⁴³ *Id.* at 187 (emphasis added).

⁴⁴ *Id.* ("Mr. Steese: We would agree with that.")

places heavy reliance upon, the Arthur Anderson audit as evidence of compliance.⁴⁵

C. Audit Prior to Section 272 Relief (Issue 272-4)

Qwest states that “[a]ny imposition of an opening audit requirement would constitute disparate regulatory treatment for QC.”⁴⁶ AT&T did not argue that an audit is required under section 272 prior to a finding that Qwest complies with section 272. Neither did AT&T argue that Qwest be the entity audited. AT&T suggested that the Commission may, and should based on the section 272 affiliates’ past section 272 violations, perform an audit of accounting safeguards of the section 272 affiliate prior to finding that Qwest is in compliance with section 272.⁴⁷

An audit would not “constitute disparate treatment” for Qwest. Section 272 compliance must be reviewed on a case-by-case basis. As was discussed in AT&T’s initial brief, the FCC has looked to a section 272 affiliate’s regular audit program to ensure compliance with GAAP and to its internal controls as evidence of compliance with section 272.⁴⁸ Qwest argues that controls are in place.⁴⁹ This is, in fact, one of the issues that ultimately must be decided, and Qwest and AT&T disagree on whether appropriate controls are in place and if those controls are working. An audit regarding these controls would assist the Commission in resolving the conflict.

In its brief, Qwest raises the point that the section 272 biennial audit of the BOC would begin “at the close of the first full year of operations.”⁵⁰ As an example, if Qwest were granted section 271 status on January 15, 2002, its “first full year of operations”

⁴⁵ Qwest Brief at 13.

⁴⁶ Qwest Brief at 33.

⁴⁷ 7 ATT 1, ¶ 35(f).

⁴⁸ AT&T Brief at 6. *See also, BellSouth Louisiana II Order*, ¶ 328.

⁴⁹ Qwest Brief at 33.

⁵⁰ *Id.*

would not be until December 31, 2003, and the biennial audit would commence sometime in 2004, with an audit opinion delivered (most likely) during the 2nd quarter of 2004.⁵¹ Given QCC's and Qwest's past departures from noncompliance, it is strongly suggested that the Commission seriously consider if it wants Qwest to operate under a shroud of secrecy for that length of time.

AT&T initially proposed that an audit be conducted to verify that all accounting safeguards are in place and operational prior to Qwest LD's provision of long-distance service. This proposal would now apply to the new section 272 affiliate, QCC. Such an audit is well within the Commission's supervisory powers, and is certainly a condition it could impose prior to a finding of section 272 compliance if the Commission believes that Qwest has not implemented the requirements of section 272, in whole or in part.

D. Section 272(b)(3) – Issue 272-7

Qwest notes that it conducted an analysis of payroll registers of both entities and found no overlap.⁵² Qwest conducted this analysis in response to AT&T's assertions that the section 272 affiliate and Qwest had not compared payroll registers.⁵³ Qwest's witness also testified that she did not personally conduct the analysis; she merely "oversaw" it, and that it was done for the "section 272 affiliate," which may or may not include QCC.⁵⁴ It is clear, though, that there is no evidence from Qwest that, for the years prior to the

⁵¹ The auditor's biennial report for Verizon Communications, Inc.'s first full year of operations (for the year 2000) in New York was not filed with the FCC until June 11, 2001 (initial report), and June 18, 2001 (supplemental report). Also, information relating to apparent violations of section 272 requirements by Verizon were redacted and are the subject of a pending FCC comment cycle. CC Docket No. 96-150 (Verizon Section 272 Compliance Biennial Audit Report). *Also see*, FCC hyperlink at: http://gullfoss2.fcc.gov/cgi-bin/websql/prod/ecfs/comsrch_v2.hts

⁵² Qwest Brief at 15.

⁵³ 7 ATT 1, ¶ 45(j).

⁵⁴ 7 Qwest 1 at 17.

analysis, a payroll register analysis was done to ensure that there was no overlap of employees between the BOC and the section 272 affiliate.

Qwest cites to the multistate transcript for its statement that “AT&T has made no claim to the contrary” regarding the existence of overlap of employees on the payroll registers.⁵⁵ This is disingenuous, because the employees’ names were blocked out on the records Mr. Skluzak had access to.⁵⁶

Qwest fails to mention that QCC recruits employees for Qwest and the impact such activity has as on the separateness requirement of this subsection.⁵⁷

Finally Qwest and QCC do not have separate payroll administration. Qwest provides payroll administration for both entities.⁵⁸ As previously discussed, the FCC looks to separate payroll administration as evidence of compliance.⁵⁹ Qwest will not acknowledge this and, instead, prefers to focus on the fact that, although separate payroll administration is evidence of compliance, it is not a requirement.⁶⁰ Although it may not be a requirement, failure to comply with this item further undermines the position that Qwest and QCC are separate.

E. Section 272(b)(5) - Issue 272-13

Qwest pats itself on the back for taking almost 10 months to bill, accrue, pay for and post 10 months of QCC transactions back to July 2000.⁶¹ QCC cannot claim that the items were accrued properly and timely paid because it admits it did not know what

⁵⁵ Qwest Brief at 15.

⁵⁶ 7 ATT 1, ¶ 45(f).

⁵⁷ *Id.*, ¶ 50(g).

⁵⁸ 7 ATT 1, ¶ 45(j). Qwest Brief at 15.

⁵⁹ 7 ATT 1, ¶ 42, n. 41.

⁶⁰ Qwest Brief at 15.

⁶¹ *Id.*, at 11.

transactions took place.⁶² Furthermore, QCC admits that the bill for transactions during the period was not submitted until May 2, 2001.⁶³

Qwest argues that, contrary to assertions by AT&T, Qwest LD did not benefit from a "float"⁶⁴ and states that "QCC does not receive extended payment terms."⁶⁵ QCC did benefit from a float and extended payment terms because none of the services rendered by Qwest to QCC from July 2000 to April 2001 were billed until May 2 (or 31), 2001. This sum did not include interest either. Interest was not included until AT&T pointed out this omission. Qwest admits that the Master Service Agreement did not include an interest component.⁶⁶ Accounting controls, properly implemented and maintained, would have captured these deficiencies. As it was, Qwest did not correct the internal control malfunction until after AT&T discovered it.

Qwest argues that these were "one-time hiccups in our accounting processes" because of the merger and redesignation of the section 272 affiliate,⁶⁷ or nonchalantly characterizes them as "some delays in billing."⁶⁸ First, these were actual transactions that Qwest should have billed to QCC in a timely manner for services Qwest provided QCC. Part 32 accounting rules were never temporarily suspended during the merger or after it. Qwest should have had no problem determining and billing for the services provided to QCC. Once again, either the internal accounting processes were not in place or there was a total collapse of them. Second, the redesignation of the section 272 affiliate, according

⁶² AT&T Brief at 12, n. 57.

⁶³ 7 Qwest 4 at 10. Curiously, in the Colorado proceedings, the QCC witness stated that the bill was submitted May 31, 2001. No explanation has been given for the change in the billing date.

⁶⁴ Qwest Brief at 24.

⁶⁵ *Id.*, at 25.

⁶⁶ *Id.*

⁶⁷ AZ TR at 22 -23 (June 11, 2001).

⁶⁸ Qwest Brief at 25.

to Qwest, did not take place until January 2001. This is well after the merger was completed and billings should have commenced, at a minimum, during the time period from January through the end of May. "Catch-up billing"⁶⁹ is not a principle found under GAAP.

F. Section 272(c)(2) - Issue 272-16

In its brief, AT&T referred to specific instances where Qwest failed to comply with section 272(c)(2).⁷⁰ In addition, AT&T maintains that if the section 272 affiliate fails to properly account for a transaction in accordance with section 272(b)(2), and the BOC also fails to properly account for the transaction, then the BOC has failed to comply with section 272(c)(2).

It is apparent that the principles of GAAP apply (*e.g.*, timeliness) to the BOC's section 272 transactions when the transaction rules of Part 32 apply. In section 272(c)(2), the Act requires the BOC to account for all transactions with the section 272 affiliate in accordance with accounting principles "designated or approved" by the FCC. The FCC has held that the BOC must comply with the Part 32 affiliate transaction rules to satisfy section 272(c).⁷¹ "GAAP is incorporated into the Commission's Uniform System of Accounts [Part 32] to the extent that regulatory considerations allow."⁷² Furthermore,

⁶⁹ 7 Qwest 2 at 8.

⁷⁰ AT&T Brief at 28.

⁷¹ *Application by Bell Atlantic New York for Authorization Under Section 271 of the Communications Act to Provide In-Region, InterLATA Service in the State of New York*, CC Docket No. 99-295, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 99-404 (rel. Dec. 22, 1999), ¶ 415 ("Bell Atlantic New York Order"). 47 C.F.R. § 32.27.

⁷² *Application of BellSouth Corporation, BellSouth Telecommunications, Inc., and BellSouth Long Distance, Inc., for Provision of In-Region, InterLATA Services in Louisiana*, CC Docket No. 98-121, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 98-271 (rel. Oct. 13, 1998), ¶ 328, n. 1026, citing 47 C.F.R. § 32.1 ("BellSouth Louisiana II Order"). 47 C.F.R. § 32.12.

Part 32 states that the BOC's financial records shall be kept in accordance with GAAP to the extent permitted by Part 32.⁷³

Thus, the BOC must comply with Part 32, and Part 32 incorporates the concept of GAAP. In other words, both Qwest and QCC, whatever side of the transaction they are on, must comply with GAAP, and depending on how a transaction is treated by the companies, there may be a violation of section 272(b)(2), section 272(c)(2), or both.

Finally, Qwest never provides a rational explanation in its testimony or brief for the failure to properly reflect affiliated amounts with QCC in its ARMIS report beyond the \$1.5 million in revenue received from QCC that was reported.⁷⁴ Qwest's assertion that it "has consistently complied with the FCC's affiliate transaction rules ...", and "[t]he FCC's reviews of QC's ARMIS reports have not identified any discrepancies with respect to QC's affiliate transactions in the past three years" is simply empty rhetoric.⁷⁵ Further, Qwest has admitted that its most recent ARMIS filing (for the year 2000) is not accompanied by a report from its independent auditors, Arthur Andersen.⁷⁶ Thus, even less probative value can be placed on the ARMIS annual report given the lack of any independent verification. Qwest may argue that this is not relevant, but it is indisputable that the FCC compares posted transactions with the BOC's ARMIS report for evidence of compliance with section 272.⁷⁷

⁷³ 47 C.F.R. § 32.12

⁷⁴ See generally, AT&T Brief at 13.

⁷⁵ Qwest Brief at 13 - 14.

⁷⁶ 7 Qwest 1 at 16. ("[T]hus the audit engagement for the year 2000 will be combined with 2001 and the report will be issued in 2002.") As will be discussed below, this lag in timing is analogous to the crucial lag in any forthcoming biennial audit report.

⁷⁷ *BellSouth Louisiana II Order*, ¶ 335.

G. Section 272(c)(1) - Issue 272-15

Qwest wishes to distill this section down to one issue:⁷⁸ whether Advanced Technologies (“AT”) was used to circumvent the requirements of this section. However, as discussed in AT&T’s brief, there is more to this issue.⁷⁹ AT&T has summarized its position in the filed testimony.⁸⁰

H. Qwest’s Past History - Issue 272-20

Qwest earnestly argues that the Commission should not examine its (and U S WEST’s and the section 272 affiliates’) past history⁸¹ and, once again, touts the biennial audit as a panacea for future protection against transgressions.⁸² As has been previously discussed, the FCC realistically might not receive a biennial audit report until mid-2004. By then, any remedial action by the FCC for noncompliance with section 272 might be of no consequence. Or, as was stated at the workshop, “the horse [will have already] left the barn.”⁸³ Thus, the Commission is again cautioned not to place heavy reliance upon Qwest’s arguments that the biennial audit process will provide protection.⁸⁴

Qwest starts with the premise that it meets all requirements of section 272, and concludes that AT&T’s arguments regarding the past are irrelevant. Therefore, it argues, AT&T is engaging in “character assassination.”⁸⁵ Qwest’s arguments are nonsensical and its *ad hominem* conclusion is unwarranted. The FCC has stated that it must make a

⁷⁸ Qwest Brief at 29.

⁷⁹ AT&T Brief at 27.

⁸⁰ 7 ATT 1, ¶¶ 124 *et seq.* Special attention should be given to ¶ 125 (a), (f) and (g), which illustrate how U S WEST was using a “straw” non-272 affiliate to circumvent the section 272 rules.

⁸¹ Qwest Brief at 36.

⁸² *Id.*, at 39.

⁸³ AZ TR at 117 (June 11, 2001).

⁸⁴ “We’d like to see the controls in place and make sure that they’re properly in place well before the biennial audit.” AZ TR at 155 (June 12, 2001).

⁸⁵ Qwest Brief at 36.

predictive judgment about the section 272 affiliate's compliance with section 272.⁸⁶ QCC's own witness acknowledged that the Commission must review past history as a predictive indicator of Section 272 compliance.⁸⁷ Qwest attempts to sweep past violations under the rug, arguing these violations are irrelevant. However, as explained in AT&T's brief, the violations of section 271 by the BOC are contrary to the requirements of section 272.⁸⁸ But more importantly, the violations reflect a decision by Qwest to test the boundaries of legally acceptable behavior.⁸⁹ This is an issue of character and is highly relevant, considering the important goals of section 272 as expressed by the FCC.⁹⁰

Qwest attempts to diminish the significance of its section 271 violations by arguing that its history of past violations hinged on the definition of "provide."⁹¹ In a strictly legal sense, this may be true. The FCC had to determine if Qwest was providing interLATA long distance service. The FCC noted:

During its own internal strategy sessions, U S WEST similarly determined that offering a package of services that includes in-region, interLATA service would afford it a means to "[target] high value customers for retention, winback and competitive response reasons..." "[i]mprove U S WEST value proposition in its toll markets by 'packaging' competitive intraLATA calling plans with a compelling long distance offer," and "[p]re-position customers for U S WEST Long Distance by providing the convenience of one-stop shopping." U S WEST stated further in its marketing plans that "[U S WEST's] endeavor with Qwest will initially allow [U S WEST] to become an interLATA carrier for customers..."⁹²

⁸⁶ *BellSouth Louisiana II Order*, ¶ 321.

⁸⁷ 7 Qwest 3 at 3, n. 2.

⁸⁸ AT&T Brief at 3-4.

⁸⁹ Qwest did not shut down the 1-800-4USWEST calling card program after the merger. Its new management must accept some accountability for the subsequent finding that the program violated section 271.

⁹⁰ See AT&T Brief at 2, quoting *Ameritech Michigan Order*, ¶ 346.

⁹¹ Qwest Brief at 37.

⁹² *AT&T Corp. et al. v U S WEST Communications, Inc.*, File No. E-98-42, Memorandum Opinion and Order, FCC 98-242 (rel. Oct. 7, 1998), ¶ 14 (footnotes omitted) (emphasis added) ("FCC Order").

It is apparent that the internal strategy sessions involved more than a semantical discussion of the word "provide." The United States Court of Appeals affirmed the FCC's conclusion "that the disputed arrangements would give the two BOCs [U S WEST and Ameritech] positions in the market for local and long distance service that would greatly advantage them once they became explicitly entitled to provide any long distance service."⁹³ The Court concluded that the FCC's approach -- to determine whether the BOC obtained a competitive advantage, thereby reducing its incentive to open the local market -- was reasonable.⁹⁴

Essentially, the Commission is making a similar decision regarding section 272. The FCC noted that the section 272 safeguards "are designed to promote competition."⁹⁵ If the safeguards are not in place before Qwest obtains section 271 relief, competitors may not "have nondiscriminatory access to essential inputs on terms that do not favor the BOC affiliate."⁹⁶

Regarding Qwest's history of provisioning of section 271 services, it should not be allowed to lay claim to its "good" history and disown the "bad."

III. CONCLUSION

Qwest continues to claim an unbroken chain of compliance with section 272 since the Act was passed. This claim is not supported by the evidence. In fact, the evidence

⁹³ *U S WEST v FCC*, 177 F.3d 1057, 1058 (D.C. Cir. 1999).

⁹⁴ *Id.*, at 1060. ("In order to determine whether a BOC is providing interLATA service within the meaning of section 271, we must assess whether a BOC's involvement in the long distance market enables it to obtain competitive advantages, thereby reducing its incentive to cooperate in opening its local market to competition." *FCC Order*, ¶ 37).

⁹⁵ *Ameritech Michigan Order*, ¶ 346.

⁹⁶ *Id.*

contradicts Qwest's claim.

It should be noted that many of the "mistakes" and problems brought to light by AT&T were corrected *after* AT&T raised the issues, not before. This alone suggests a lack of internal controls, processes, and training. Solving the problems after the fact does not erase the history of these underlying deficiencies.

Finally, a future section 272 Biennial Audit does not justify noncompliance. Between audits, carriers may be discriminated against. The "float" issue provides a glaring example. It is illogical to assume that Qwest would allow a non-affiliated interexchange carrier to go 10 months without a bill and not provide for interest in the initial contract terms. Simply having QCC subsequently amend its contract and pay interest does not "cure" the problem because for 10 months QCC had a distinct advantage over other interexchange carriers. This sort of behavior exemplifies why it is imperative that processes and internal controls are in place before section 271 relief is granted. Qwest has not made an adequate showing of compliance with section 272.

The Commission should find that Qwest is not in compliance and in the future will not comply with section 272.

Respectfully submitted this 7th day of September 2001.

**AT&T COMMUNICATIONS OF THE
MOUNTAIN STATES, INC., AT&T
LOCAL SERVICES ON BEHALF OF TCG
PHOENIX**

By:



Mary B. Tribby
Richard S. Wolters
1875 Lawrence Street, Suite 1575
Denver, Colorado 80202
Telephone: (303) 298-6741

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that the original and 10 copies of AT&T's Reply Brief on Section 272 of the Act in Docket No. T-00000A-97-0238 were sent by overnight delivery on September 7, 2001 to:

Arizona Corporation Commission
Docket Control – Utilities Division
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

and a true and correct copy was sent by overnight delivery on September 7, 2001 to:

Maureen Scott
Legal Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Mark A. DiNunzio
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Deborah Scott
Director - Utilities Division
Arizona Corporation Commission
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Christopher Kempley
Arizona Corporation Commission
Legal Division
1200 West Washington Street
Phoenix, AZ 85007

Jane Rodda
Administrative Law Judge
Arizona Corporation Commission
400 West Congress
Tucson, AZ 85701-1347

and a true and correct copy was sent by U. S. Mail on September 7, 2001 to:

Thomas F. Dixon
WorldCom, Inc.
707 – 17th Street, #3900
Denver, CO 80202

Terry Tan
WorldCom, Inc.
201 Spear Street, 9th Floor
San Francisco, CA 94015

Douglas Hsiao
Rhythms Links, Inc.
9100 E. Mineral Circle
Englewood, CO 80112

Bradley Carroll
Cox Arizona Telcom, L.L.C.
1550 West Deer Valley Road
Phoenix, AZ 85027

Michael M. Grant
Gallagher and Kennedy
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225

Penny Bewick
New Edge Networks
3000 Columbia House Blvd., Suite 106
Vancouver, WA 98661

Gena Doyscher
Global Crossing Local Services, Inc.
1221 Nicollet Mall, Suite 300
Minneapolis MN 55403

Traci Kirkpatrick
Davis Wright Tremaine LLP
1300 S.W. Fifth Avenue
Portland, OR 97201

Michael W. Patten
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf, PLC
400 North Fifth Street, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85004-3906

Joyce Hundley
United States Dept. of Justice
Antitrust Division
1401 H Street NW, Suite 8000
Washington, DC 20530

Daniel Pozefsky
Residential Utility Consumer Office
2828 North Central Ave., #1200
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Mark N. Rogers
Excell Agent Services, L.L.C.
2175 W. 14th Street
Tempe, AZ 85281

Mark P. Trinchero
Davis Wright Tremaine
1300 SW Fifth Ave., Suite 2300
Portland OR 97201-5682

Michael B. Hazzard
Kelley, Drye & Warren, LLP
1200 19th Street, NW, Fifth Floor
Washington, DC 20036

Daniel Waggoner
Davis Wright Tremaine
2600 Century Square
1501 Fourth Avenue
Seattle, WA 98101-1688

Thomas H. Campbell
Lewis & Roca LLP
40 N. Central Avenue
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Karen L. Clauson
Eschelon Telecom, Inc.
730 2nd Avenue South, Suite 1200
Minneapolis, MN 55402

Joan S. Burke
Osborn Maledon, P.A.
2929 N. Central Avenue, 21st Floor
Phoenix, AZ 85067-6379

Eric S. Heath
Sprint Communications Company L.P.
100 Spear Street, Suite 930
San Francisco, CA 94105

Charles Kallenbach
American Communications Services, Inc.
131 National Business Parkway
Annapolis Junction, MD 20701

Jeffrey W. Crockett
Snell & Wilmer, LLP
One Arizona Center
Phoenix, AZ 85004-0001

Todd C. Wiley
Gallagher & Kennedy, P.A.
2575 East Camelback Road
Phoenix, AZ 85016-9225

Andrew Crain
Qwest Corporation
1801 California Street, Suite 4900
Denver, CO 80202

Janet Livengood
Regional Vice President
Z-Tel Communications, Inc.
601 S. Harbour Island Blvd., Suite 220
Tampa, FL 33602

Timothy Berg
Fennemore Craig, P.C.
3003 North Central Ave., #2600
Phoenix, AZ 85012

Raymond S. Heyman
Randall H. Warner
Roshka Heyman & DeWulf
Two Arizona Center
400 N. Fifth Street, Suite 1000
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Diane Bacon, Legislative Director
Communications Workers of America
Arizona State Council
District 7 AFL-CIO, CLC
5818 N. 7th Street, Suite 206
Phoenix, AZ 85014-5811

Andrea P. Harris
Senior Manager, Regulatory
Allegiance Telecom, Inc.
2101 Webster, Suite 1580
Oakland, CA 94612

K. Megan Doberneck
Covad Communications Company
7901 Lowry Blvd.
Denver, CO 80230

Charles W. Steese
Qwest Corporation
1801 California Street, Suite 4900
Denver, CO 80202

Bill Haas
Richard Lipman
McLeodUSA Telecommunications
Services, Inc.
6400 C Street SW
Cedar Rapids, IA 54206-3177

Mark Dioguardi
Tiffany and Bosco, P.A.
500 Dial Tower
1850 North Central Ave.
Phoenix, AZ 85004

Brian Thomas
Vice President – Regulatory
Time Warner Telecom, Inc.
520 S.W. 6th Avenue, Suite 300
Portland, OR 97204


